

Advisory Committee on Land Record Modernization Standards
Meeting Notes 8-19-2004
by Erik Hubl

Meeting discussions from the 4th meeting of the LRM Standards Committee.

Attendance: Larry Zink, Erik Hubl, Dan Silvis, Jim Koch, Jim Langtry, Bill Sheldon – Terrascan Inc.

Both John Beran and Gail Knapp had excused absences.

The meeting began at 1:07. Larry provided us with an agenda for the meeting. We began by reviewing the information packet supplied to us last time by Jim K.

In discussing the county abstract – which is an overall summary of the valuations in a county for a given year – this information is forwarded to DPAT in paper form. Yet, some counties also submit digital variations of this information. Bill asked if there are any statutory requirements for submitting both a paper version and a digital version.

Dan explained to us how Douglas county had “so many” parcels to summarize last year that the totals did not enter correctly into the summary fields of the (PDF) digital form. It was determined that there was a software error where the field lengths in the digital submittal form were not long enough to contain such large numbers.

Counties also send “qualified” sales information to DPAT. These are property sales that best reflect the market and do not include estate sales or transfers amongst family members. This information is used by DPAT to help verify the sales ratios for a county. The assessment to sales ratio is used to determine the overall level of value (LOV) for classes and subclasses of real property in a county. The level of value is used in statewide equalization by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission. Level of value is also used in calculating state aid to schools by the Department of Education.

Bill pointed out that a lot of entities rely on the data obtained by DPAT. These include property managers as well as taxing authorities like school districts. But he pointed out that the record is incomplete without the spatial component.

We next discussed the Real Estate Transfer Statement (also know as form 521). The filling out of this form is really a process. It begins at time of closing on a property and involves several different local and state offices. There are 4 (copies) with this document. After the closing, the 521 and the deed are brought to the Register of Deeds office and filed.

The Register of Deeds office records and files the deed and forwards the 521 copies to their respective destinations.

The front (white) page gets submitted to the Nebraska Dept. of Revenue. The Department of Revenue uses the form to reconcile the submission of the Documentary Stamp Tax forwarded by the county clerk/register of deeds. When this process is completed, the Department of Revenue forwards the white (“ROD”) copy to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. DPAT creates a data file of the sale price and documentary

stamp tax paid for the parcel identifying the transaction by book & page number and date of sale.

The 2nd and 3rd (canary and pink) pages get submitted to the County Assessor.

The last (goldenrod) page is the grantees copy.

Sometimes a supplemental sheet is included (for agricultural land or if more space is needed for long legal descriptions).

The Assessor receives the two copies as notification that a property has sold and forwards the second (pink) copy to DPAT (who joins it with the Dept of Revenue copy) and captures the book & page number and date that the registrar filed it under. For sales in excess of \$100 or for which more than \$1.75 in documentary stamp tax have been paid, the assessor forwards a supplemental sheet which contains parcel-specific information regarding the land and lots and improvements on the parcel of land including but not limited to zoning, location, occupancy code of building, size, construction type, age, and condition and assessed value.

Someone brought up the question on whether this could be an on-line PDF form that could be filled out and printed.

On the topic of field definitions on items required by DPAT from the counties, Jim K. had asked the IT folks to help but they felt that it would take quite a bit of work to gather that information.

Jim K. said he thought data transfer agreements have been set up between DPAT and Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy and maybe Scott Bluff.

Bill thought he might be able to obtain data field sizes and definitions from his Terrascan product. He will check into that.

Next Bill brought up an interesting aspect that he has encountered in his work with various counties. He has found out that the parent/child parcel-ID relationship is not being performed the same way in all counties.

Example: A tract of land is split into 2 parcels. The original parcel-ID of the tract was 1001.

County A: will split parcel 1001 into 2 parcels with two unique numbers (9001, 9002)

County B: will split parcel 1001 into 2 parcels with one of the pieces retaining the original number (1001, 9001).

Someone asked if there were any laws or regulations that specify how parcel splits and the parcel-ID numbering is suppose to take place.

Now another sticky issue involves how the Treasurer and the Assessor each have to deal with a parcel with back taxes due. A land owner can sell off a piece of his land (split) and the deed can be filed. The new owner of the piece assumes ownership – legally. However, the Treasurer finds out that back taxes are due on the original piece and can't proceed with the two new accounts until those back taxes are paid in full. According to

Bill S., the Assessor can “override” that situation and create two accounts while the Treasurer can not.

Larry asked Jim K. for several items for our next meeting:

1. A copy of form 521 and supplemental sheets
2. Any regulations that define the Sales File reporting including field name definitions (field lengths, alpha-numeric and so on)
3. Need to develop a narrative on the sales file needs.

Jim K. reiterated that one of Cathy’s priorities is to receive sales files from counties automatically.

Bill S. described the flow of operations as follows:

Register of Deeds -> County Assessor -> County Treasurer
(Sec. of State) (DPAT) (State Auditor / State Treasurer)

Next we began to review the listing of recommendations from the guidebook that were reprinted by Larry and included with our agenda.

On Larry’s agenda (page 5) Geodetic Control Section:

- A) Shall use NAD83 and NAVD88 in both cases of funding and without funding. This is an important base concept and it is felt that any future datum adjustments that may need to take place can be done with newer technology and techniques.
- B) Shall use State Plane Coordinate System NAD83 in both cases of funding and without funding. This is a one-projection statewide system that will allow any mapping project in Nebraska to fit together. It was suggested that some re-wording be done to this recommendation due to the fact that Lancaster has developed a local projection to use. It is relatively easy for geo-spatial datasets to be re-projected to any other map projection. It was pointed out that Lancaster County has gone beyond the stated recommendation by refining a map projection based on local geography.
- C) Recommend that multipurpose cadastres be tied to the National Spatial Reference System. Perhaps this could be blended into item B.
- D) Recommend that the reference framework will be the PLSS (section corners). This is tied with the standard of using GPS to survey PLSS corners that define the perimeter of the County.
- E) Recommend the use of both a PLSS framework (base map) as well as a Surface Features Base Map (aerial map). We should change this to clearly indicate the use of an aerial or more precisely, an ortho-image. 2 complete state wide DOQQ sets currently exist for Nebraska and can be obtained easily.
- F) Recommend adhering to National Map Accuracy Standards. This still remains just a recommendation. It really points out the national standards for printed map products. It lists the intended map scale and the corresponding horizontal accuracy of the product at that printed scale.

- G) A recommendation that each PLSS corner should have a unique corner identifier as well as the coordinates of that location. This information should be part of the attribute database.
- H) A recommendation that individual county projects consider coordinating with the State Surveyors office to explore the possible use of BLM (GMM) to develop the PLSS framework. (However, it was pointed out to us that the BLM product does not create unique corner names for township perimeter corners – they can have several names because they are common corners with more than one township). Larry said he would dialogue with SSO on items G and H.
- I)
- J)
- K) incomplete discussion
- L)
- M)

At the end of the meeting, Jim K handed out two documents for review.

Standard on Digital Cadastral Maps and Parcel Identifiers Approved July 2003 by IAAO (International Association of Assessing Officers)

1.Scope: This standard provides recommendations on the development and maintenance of digital cadastral map layers and parcel identifiers. It describes digital mapping system components, content, design, preparation, maintenance, and contracts. It also discusses deed processing and parcel identification systems. This standard addresses computerized mapping systems; see the *Standard on Manual Cadastral Mapping* (2003) for information on manual parcel mapping.

Standard on Manual Cadastral Maps and Parcel Identifiers Draft 4 (4-23-04) by IAAO (International Association of Assessing Officers)

1.Scope: This standard provides recommendations on the development and maintenance of cadastral maps and parcel identifiers, using primarily manual methods. It describes the components of a basic mapping system and addresses map content, design, preparation, materials, security and maintenance. It also discusses requirements for an effective parcel identification system as a common index to all property records.

Next meeting: Wed, September 22nd, 2004 1:00 PM NDOR